

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

A petition to extend the time for response by two (2) months is enclosed herewith.

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 17, 19, 20, and 23 have been amended. Claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled from the application. The specification has been amended. Claims 1-9, 12-17, 19, 20, and 23 remain in the application.

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Also on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the specification has been objected to. On page 3 of the Office Action, 8, 9, 19, and 20 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 3, 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1- 6 and 23 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Peterson (U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 7 – 9, 12 – 17, 19, and 20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Peterson (U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

With respect to the objection to the drawings on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, Applicant has submitted herewith an amendment to Page 8 of the specification that clarifies the description of the step 6. Therefore, the objection is believed to have been overcome.

With respect to the objection to the specification on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 23 have been amended so as to a “cylindrical” shape in lieu of reciting an “annular” shape. Therefore, the objection is believed to have been overcome.

With respect to the objection to 8, 9, 19, and 20 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) page 3 of the Office Action, 8, 9, 19, and 20 have been amended. Therefore, the objection is believed to have been overcome.

With respect to the rejection of claims 3, 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 23 have been amended. Therefore, the rejection is believed to have been overcome.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed would be helpful.

Claim 1, as currently amended, recites a device for leading and holding electrical lines in a swivel region of doors, wherein the swivel region of a door is at a location at which a door pivots about a pivot axis relative to a door frame. The inventive device includes first and second tubular portions each having a respective sleeve region with a cylindrical cross-section and being shaped in the form of a crank. The sleeve regions are joined together to rotate against one another with the first tubular portion being securable to a door and the second tubular portion being securable to a door frame on which the door is pivotally mounted. The first and second portions each have a lead-through region, the lead-through regions of the first and second portions together providing a passage through which at least one electrical line can be passed for extending the at least one electrical line to and between the door and the door frame.

U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson discloses a hinge through which an electrical circuit is completed. The hinge includes a frame leaf (10) and a door leaf (12). The frame leaf (10) includes a hinge pin (14) having a bore (34) extending completely through the pin (14) and at its upper end the pin (14) is tapered and provided with a cross slot (36) (column 3, lines 28-34). The frame leaf (10) includes a milled groove (26) for receiving wire (46). The door leaf (12) includes a bore (52) for receiving the hinge pin (14) and a milled groove (56), which accommodates a wire (72).

The wires 72 leading from the frame leaf 10 of the arrangement disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson are connected to an alarm in a remote security room, while the wires 46 leading from the door leaf 72 are connected to the lock in the door 2. When the door 2 is completely closed, the contact blade 70 engages the split slip ring 42. However, when the door 2 opens the receptacle 64 rotates with the knuckle 50, and this rotation causes the contact blade 70 to move over the slit 44 between the ends of the ring 42 (FIG. 9). The circuitry is such that the break in the circuit through the blade 70 and the slip ring 42 causes an alarm to be energized at a remote control room. The circuits through the other contact blades 68 and their corresponding slip rings 40 remain complete irrespective of the position of the hinge.

U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson does not show a device for leading and holding electrical lines in a swivel region of doors, as recited in claim 1, as currently amended, of the present application. Instead, U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson discloses wires 72 (leading from the frame leaf 10) connected to an alarm and a set of wires 46 (leading from the door leaf 72) that are completely separate from the wires 72 and connected to the lock in the door 2. Thus, neither the wires 72 nor the wires 46 are led through the arrangement disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson and that prior art arrangement does not teach or disclose a device for leading and holding electrical lines in a swivel region of doors. In contrast, claim 1, as currently amended, of the present application, recites the feature that: "said first and second portions each have a lead-through region, the lead-through regions of said first and second portions together providing a passage through which at least one electrical line can be passed for extending the at least one electrical line to and between the door and the door frame."

It is further submitted that claims 2-9 depending ultimately from claim 1, as currently amended, of the present application, and claims 12-17, and 19- 20, and 23 are allowable over U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9, 12-17, and 19- 20, and 23 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Russell W. Warnock

Name of Attorney Signing

Respectfully Submitted



Russell W. Warnock

Registration No. 32,860

November 4, 2005

BSH Home Appliances Corp.

100 Bosch Blvd

New Bern, NC 28562

Phone: 252-672-7927

Fax: 714-845-2807

russ.warnock@bshg.com